UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JENNIFER KWASNIEWSKI, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,	Case No. 2:12-cv-00515-GMN-CWH
vs.	ORDER
SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, et al.,	
Defendants.	
	_)

Presently before the court is Plaintiff Jennifer Kwasniewski's Motion to Stay or in the Alternative, Motion to Extend Scheduling Order Dates (ECF No. 215), filed on July 10, 2017. Defendant Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC filed a response (ECF No. 221) on July 24, 2017. Plaintiff filed a reply (ECF No. 222) on July 24, 2017.

Plaintiff seeks a stay of all proceedings, citing impending discovery deadlines and the lack of any response from Defendant. Plaintiff argues that she should not be compelled to engage in expert discovery or forgo the opportunity to amend her pleadings until after Defendant files an answer, so a stay is necessary. Plaintiff requests a extension of discovery deadlines in the alternative. Defendant does not take a position on the motion, but indicates it is willing to consider an extension of discovery.

District courts have broad discretion to control their own dockets. *M.M. v. Lafayette School Dist.*, 681 F.3d 1082, 1091 (9th Cir. 2012). In considering whether to stay proceedings, the court must weigh competing interests such as possible damages that may result, the hardship or inequity which may be suffered if the parties are required to move forward, and the orderly course of justice. *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962). Here, Plaintiff has not shown good cause for a stay at this time, citing only the approaching discovery deadlines in support of her request. It is not clear why an indefinite stay of all deadlines and proceedings would be necessary when the

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7

28

only object of such a stay would be to avoid expiration of certain discovery deadlines. The Court will deny Plaintiff's motion, but will entertain a further motion or stipulation to extend discovery.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Stay or in the Alternative, Motion to Extend Scheduling Order Dates (ECF No. 215) is DENIED without prejudice.

DATED: July 31, 2017

C.W. Hoffman, Jr. United States Magistrate Jidge

2